

# CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

Volume IV

March, 1933

Number 3

## CONTENTS

	Page
Directory of the State Department of Education.....	118
Shall California's Public Schools Be Closed?.....	119
Reductions in School District Budgets, 1932-1933.....	123
Public Schools Week.....	134
Departmental Communications.....	135
Interpretations of School Law.....	139
For Your Information.....	141
Professional Literature.....	154



**Official Publication Issued Monthly by the  
California State Department of Education**

Entered as second-class matter May 8, 1930, at the Post Office at Sacramento, California,  
under the Act of August 24, 1912

# **DIRECTORY OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

## **STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

	Term expires
Dr. Lewis P. Crutcher, Long Beach (President).....	1936
Allen T. Archer, 215 West Sixth street, Los Angeles.....	1936
E. P. Clarke, Riverside.....	1936
Miss Alice H. Dougherty, 4508 Pleasant Valley court, Oakland.....	1936
R. E. Golway, Sacramento.....	1935
Gordon Gray, Bank of America Building, San Diego.....	1934
Daniel C. Murphy, 90 Justin drive, San Francisco.....	1934
Miss Alice Rose Power, 233 Claremont, San Francisco.....	1935

**Vierling Kersey, Secretary and Executive Officer**  
**Mrs. Florence B. Argall, Assistant Secretary**

### **STAFF**

(Unless otherwise indicated all staff members may be reached at Sacramento)

**Vierling Kersey, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Director of Education**  
**Pauline Winner (Mrs.), Administrative Assistant**  
**Alfred E. Lentz, Administrative Adviser**  
**Marion H. Ketcham, Assistant Secretary and Principal Clerk, Public School Teachers' Retirement Salary Fund Board**  
**Henry M. Lynn, Departmental Accountant**  
**Sam H. Cohn, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction**  
**Walter E. Morgan, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction and Chief of Division of Research and Statistics**  
**C. F. Muncy, Assistant Chief**  
**Irene Taylor Heineman (Mrs.), Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, 311 California State Building, Los Angeles**  
**Ivan R. Waterman, Chief of Division of Textbooks and Publications**  
**W. S. Dyas, Chief of Bureau of State Printed Textbooks**  
**Evelyn A. Clement (Mrs.), Chief of Division of Teacher Training and Certification**  
**J. C. Beswick, Assistant Executive Officer, Commission for Vocational Education and Chief of Bureau of Trade and Industrial Education**  
**Julian A. McPhee, Chief of Bureau of Agricultural Education**  
**Ira W. Kibby, Chief of Bureau of Business Education**  
**Maude I. Murchie, Chief of Bureau of Home-Making Education**  
**H. D. Hicker, Chief of Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation**  
**J. M. Dodd, District Supervisor of Vocational Rehabilitation, 303 State Building, San Francisco**  
**W. E. Smith, District Supervisor of Vocational Rehabilitation, 107 California State Building, Los Angeles**  
**L. B. Travers, Chief of Division of Adult and Continuation Education, 311 California State Building, Los Angeles**  
**Herbert R. Stolz, M.D., Chief of Bureau of Parent Education, 2739 Bancroft way, Berkeley**  
**J. F. Dale, Bureau of Parent Education**  
**Gertrude Laws, Bureau of Parent Education, 311 California State Building, Los Angeles**  
**Magdalene F. Wanzar (Mrs.), Chief of Bureau of Immigrant Education, 317 State Building, San Francisco**  
**Helen Heffernan, Chief of Division of Elementary Education and Rural schools**  
**Gladys L. Potter (Mrs.), Assistant Chief**  
**N. P. Neilson, Chief of Division of Health and Physical Education**  
**Winifred Van Hagen, Chief of Bureau of Physical Education for Girls**  
**Mabel R. Gillis, State Librarian, Chief of Division of Libraries**  
**Eleanor Hitt, Assistant Librarian**  
**Andrew P. Hill, Jr., Chief of Division of Schoolhouse Planning**  
**Charles W. Bursch, Assistant Chief**  
**J. A. Burkman, Research Expert and Adviser for Teachers Colleges**  
**Nicholas Ricciardi, Chief of Division of Secondary Education**  
**\_\_\_\_\_, Chief of Division of Special Education**  
**R. S. French, Chief of Bureau for the Education of the Blind, Principal California School for the Blind, Berkeley**  
**Elwood A. Stevenson, Chief of Bureau for the Education of the Deaf, Principal California School for the Deaf, Berkeley**  
**Lillian B. Hill (Mrs.), Chief of Bureau of Mental Hygiene**  
**Mabel F. Gifford (Mrs.), Chief of Bureau of Correction of Speech Defects, 317 State Building, San Francisco**

CALIFORNIA STATE PRINTING OFFICE  
 HARRY HAMMOND, STATE PRINTER  
 SACRAMENTO, 1933

# Shall Public Schools in California Be Closed?

V. KERSEY, *Superintendent of Public Instruction*

The people of California may soon be faced with the momentous question: Shall public schools in California be closed? The answer to this question will determine the fate of their public schools and the welfare of their children. Realization of the stark reality and imminence of this question requires that the facts be presented to the people in order that they may be aided in deciding this question—in so far as it is now still within their power to decide.

Demands for relief from excessive taxation in order to lighten the burdens of the present economic depression made themselves immediately felt in reduction of school district taxes throughout the state as early as during the school year 1930-31. In the following year, 1931-32, these demands, strengthened by the organized activities of state and local taxpayers' associations and other groups, resulted in more drastic curtailment of school district budgets. During this time school administrators and school boards throughout the state, stimulated in many cases by the State Department of Education, took every possible step to increase the efficiency of their management of the public schools and to eliminate all unnecessary costs.

The result of this activity was an actual reduction of almost ten million dollars in the public school expenditures for 1931-32 as compared with those of 1930-31. This reduction was effected by postponing construction of new buildings and purchase of needed equipment; by increasing teaching loads, thus avoiding the employment of new teachers to care for increased enrollments; by consolidating functions; by reducing teachers' salaries; and by every other device available.

At the time of the preparation of the school district budgets for 1932-33—the current school year—the demand for further reductions of school costs was even more insistent, and much more highly organized, than it had been during the preceding two years. It was plainly evident from the facts, that reductions in the budgets of other local governmental units were not so drastically made in most instances, and that

People of California must decide question:

Shall public schools in California be closed?

Demands for escape from excessive taxation resulted in drastic school budget reductions

Ten million dollars saved by schools in 1931-32

Highly organized insistence that school costs be further reduced

the major portion of the burden of reduced tax support was required to be borne by the public schools. Nevertheless, it was demanded that the school costs again be cut in order to afford further relief.

Reductions in school expenditures estimated as equal to all other governmental savings

Numerous estimates have been made, since the budgets of the school districts for the current school year were completed, as to the amount of the reduction effected in these budgets. Estimates indicated that the total reduction in school district budgets was almost equal to all reductions made this year in the budgets of all other local governmental units. The estimates varied, but the highest placed the reduction at between \$25,000,000 and \$30,000,000.

State Department of Education study shows saving for 1932-33 to exceed \$48,000,000

Statistical data have just been compiled by the State Department of Education from official reports of county superintendents of schools, showing the aggregate amount of the budgeted receipts of all school districts in the state for this school year. These amounts have been compared with the actual receipts of all school districts for the past school year.

*The comparison shows an actual total reduction of over forty-eight million dollars. The precise amount of the reduction is \$48,767,573.98. This represents a reduction, in one year, of 27.6 per cent.*

In the following article by Walter E. Morgan (page 123), there are presented the exact figures for each county in the state, showing the district receipts during 1931-32, the budgeted receipts for 1932-33, and the amount of the reduction below the previous year's receipts. These statistics are reliable and accurate. They present the cold, hard facts relative to the actual reductions which have been made in school support.

Total saving during past biennium of over \$58,700,000

When the reduction made in school expenditures in 1931-32, amounting to nearly \$10,000,000, or 6.5 per cent, is added to the reduction made in school district budgets this year, the total reduction for the two years amounts to the staggering total of over \$58,700,000.

Reductions have been so drastic in many cases that many schools must close before end of school year

That drastic action has been taken by school boards throughout the state to pare school costs down to the quick is only too evident. It should be just as evident to the people of the state that they have in many cases already gone too far in their program of school budget reductions. *The total budget for this school year, \$128,121,970.92, as contrasted with the budget of \$176,889,544.90 in 1931-32, represents such a tremendous reduction that it will be literally impossible for many school districts to maintain school until the close of this school year. Moreover, in hundreds of other districts, the*



educational program has been so impoverished, and teachers have been required to carry such heavy loads in the form of large classes and long hours of instruction, that the children can not possibly derive more than a bare minimum of real education from the school program.

The question, "Shall public schools in California be closed?" is no rhetorical question. It is an immediate challenge arising from the concrete facts of present conditions. Already, requests have been received from several counties, asking whether the school districts therein will be denied state and county apportionments if they are unable to keep their schools open for the minimum time required by law. In other cases it has been asked whether school boards, unable to pay the salaries of their teachers for the full school year, can legally require their teachers to serve out the year without pay, and whether school boards can arrange to pay next year the salaries which will be owed to teachers for service rendered this year.

Closing of  
schools is  
imminent

These facts and the realization that the full extent of the effects of the drastic reductions in school budgets has not yet been felt, present a startling challenge. There seems to be nothing which can be done to improve the situation during the remainder of this school year. Taxes have been levied, and no further levies can be made until next September. The people of the State of California, however, must face the facts. They must decide whether they will permit these conditions to continue, or even to grow worse, or whether they will demand a restoration of adequate support for their schools. If they desire to do nothing, that is their sovereign prerogative. If they desire good schools for their children, however, they must take steps to require that harmful reductions in school support shall cease and that the schools shall be supported on an adequate basis. The question is clearly before the people. They must decide whether their schools shall be closed or the program of the schools rendered ineffective, or whether they shall continue to maintain the type of public schools which has been characteristic of their state.

Harmful  
reduc-  
tions  
must  
cease if  
children  
are to  
receive  
adequate  
educa-  
tional  
opportu-  
nities

Restoration of adequate school support is absolutely imperative if this generation of school children are not to be required to bear the burden of current economic conditions. The conditions which have resulted from drastic reductions in school support must be corrected before irreparable harm has been done. Continuance of the present low level of school support can not be permitted by the people of this state.

Irrepar-  
able harm  
will be  
done if  
minimum  
support  
is not  
restored

Local school boards have voluntarily reduced budgets in response to the need for local tax relief. In many cases such reductions have been made as part of a general state-wide program of reduction even though there has been no real need locally for such reductions. It is now time for the people of the several school districts to require that some semblance of adequate school support be restored, even under the present inequitable tax system which places the major burden of school support upon local property owners.

The present status of school support has been brought about by drastic reductions in school district tax rates and less drastic by considerable reductions in county school tax rates accompanied by marked reductions in assessed valuations. The combination of reduction in tax rates and in assessed valuations resulted in a pyramiding of the enforced reductions in school support. Increases in local tax rates or in assessments of properties locally taxed must be secured where necessary in order to restore at least a basic minimum public school program, which is no longer possible with the reduced support provided by present local tax levies.

Perma-  
nent  
relief  
depend-  
ent  
upon  
radical  
revision  
of state  
tax  
system to  
relieve  
property  
tax  
burden

It is evident that temporary relief only will result from the restoration of a part of the funds of which the public schools have been deprived by reductions in local support. Permanent guarantee of adequate educational opportunities is possible only by radical revision of the state tax system so as to relieve property owners of a major part of their present burden of taxation for the support of schools. *This constitutes the most vital issue before the people and the Legislature of California today.* It is not the total cost of the public schools, or of all government, which is the cause of present unsatisfactory conditions.

Broader  
tax base  
essential

If we grant that governmental costs are excessive and should be reduced, even as school costs have been reduced, yet the total amount of such reductions which it is possible to make without crippling essential governmental and social services would afford but slight relief to the majority of taxpayers. The required permanent relief can be secured only by so broadening the base of taxation as to require all of the people to pay their just share of the costs of government. The common property taxpayer can no longer afford to bear the brunt of school and governmental costs.

Shall  
schools be  
supported  
by in-  
equitable  
taxation  
or shall  
present  
system  
be  
revised?

The issue, we believe, is clearly stated. It is one which requires the people themselves to decide whether their desire for good schools for their children is strong enough to demand that adequate support be restored. If so, they must also decide whether they will continue to permit the burden of school support to be borne in such unjust measure by property, or whether they will demand tax revision which will distribute that burden more equitably.

# Reductions in School District Budgets, 1932-1933

WALTER E. MORGAN, *Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction*

The Division of Research and Statistics has completed a comparison of the aggregate amount of school district budgets of California for the current school year with the actual district receipts for 1931-32. The following tabulations present the data for each county showing this comparison.

## Summary of Total Reductions Effected

In Table No. 6 is presented a summary of the actual amounts and percentages of reduction effected in the budgets of the current school year in each type of school district in the state. The total amounts and percentages of the actual budgetary reductions effected for the entire state are indicated in the following total comparisons.

### *Elementary School Districts*

Receipts, 1931-32-----	\$91,356,234.05	
Budgeted, 1932-33-----	66,045,932.62	
Reduction -----		\$25,310,301.43 or 27.7%

### *High School Districts*

Receipts, 1931-32-----	\$80,491,112.78	
Budgeted, 1932-33-----	58,097,203.30	
Reduction -----		\$22,393,909.48 or 27.8%

### *Junior College Districts*

Receipts, 1931-32-----	\$5,042,198.07	
Budgeted, 1932-33-----	3,978,835.00	
Reduction -----		\$1,063,363.07 or 21.1%

### *Total—All Districts*

Receipts, 1931-32-----	\$176,889,544.90	
Budgeted, 1932-33-----	128,121,970.92	
Reduction -----		\$48,767,573.98 or 27.6%

The State Department of Education is not as yet in possession of data showing the amounts of reduction in other governmental budgets during the current fiscal year. It is our belief, however, based upon tentative estimates, including the estimates of the State Chamber of Commerce, that the amount of the reduction in school district budgets will exceed by a considerable sum the total amount of reductions in all other governmental budgets within the state this year.

The figures cited above from Table No. 6 showing a total reduction of more than forty-eight and one-half million dollars in the school district budgets, are derived from the statistics contained in Tables No. 1 to No. 5, inclusive. In these tables there is first presented a statement of the actual total receipts of all school districts by types of districts and by counties during the school year 1931-32. Following there are presented summaries of the total amounts estimated to be received by all school districts in the state for 1932-33. These estimates are shown in Tables No. 2 to No. 5, inclusive. The budget estimates are reported in such way as to give separately the amounts budgeted for teachers' salaries; for all current expenses, including teachers' salaries; for capital outlays; and for the total amounts estimated to be received by the school districts. These data are presented separately for elementary school districts, high school districts and junior college districts, a total for all types of districts being presented in Table No. 5, while the comparison between the actual receipts of 1931-32 and the budgeted receipts for 1932-33 are given for each type of school district and for all districts in Table No. 6.

This comparison of the actual receipts of 1931-32 with the budgeted receipts for 1932-33 is an entirely valid comparison. The receipts of 1931-32 include all amounts received by the school districts during that year, including prior year balances, state and county apportionments, district taxes, miscellaneous receipts, and transfers from other counties or other school districts. The budgeted receipts for 1932-33 include all amounts anticipated to be received from these same sources. The budgets for 1932-33 include amounts which will be retained by the districts at the close of the year as balances from which to pay salary and other warrants for the month of June and also expenses of the districts incurred in July and August prior to the receipt of state apportionments in September. Since the actual receipts of the school districts for 1931-32 include similar amounts to be carried forward as balances at the close of that year, the 1932-33 budgeted receipts are directly comparable with such actual receipts on this basis. In fact, the 1932-33 budgeted receipts must be considered as maximum estimates since it is entirely probable that the districts will receive somewhat smaller amounts than estimated in their budgets. This is due to the fact that actual tax delinquencies probably will be considerably greater in a large number of counties than the delinquencies anticipated when the budgets were compiled. Estimates of tax delinquencies for the current year indicate that they will amount to approximately 15 per cent and probably may be even greater. In the fixing of the tax rates levied during the current school year most of the counties allowed for a 10 per cent delinquency as required by law, while in a considerable number of the counties this legal requirement was violated, only 5 per cent being allowed for anticipated delinquencies in these counties.

### Teachers' Salary Reductions

It is impossible from the data available at present to give exact figures showing the amounts of reductions made in teachers' salaries. The information which has been obtained relative to the budgets of the districts for the current year indicate the amounts budgeted for teachers' salaries. These amounts have been compared with the actual expenditures for teachers' salaries made by the districts in 1931-32. This comparison does not, of course, show the actual total amount of reduction effected in expenditures for this purpose, since the amounts included for teachers' salaries in the current year budgets include amounts which will be expended in July and August of 1933. Moreover, adjustments and reductions have been made in salary schedules during the current year subsequent to the adoption of the district budgets. The following figures show a comparison between the total amounts budgeted for teachers' salaries this year as compared with the amounts expended for teachers' salaries last year but do not indicate even the minimum amount of reduction actually effected in teachers' salaries. The comparison is offered to indicate that the actual reduction in teachers' salaries will be at least considerably greater than the difference between these two sets of figures.

#### *Elementary School Districts*

Teachers' salaries, 1931-32	-----	\$46,991,111.78
Budgeted for teachers' salaries, 1932-33	-----	43,053,010.73

Reduction	-----	\$3,938,101.05 or 8.4%
-----------	-------	------------------------

#### *High School Districts*

Teachers' salaries, 1931-32	-----	\$41,687,507.32
Budgeted for teachers' salaries, 1932-33	-----	37,853,344.03

Reduction	-----	\$3,834,163.29 or 9.2%
-----------	-------	------------------------

#### *Junior College Districts*

Teachers' salaries, 1931-32	-----	\$2,141,532.90
Budgeted for teachers' salaries, 1932-33	-----	2,098,376.00

Reduction	-----	\$43,156.90 or 2.0%
-----------	-------	---------------------

#### *Total—All Districts*

Teachers' salaries, 1931-32	-----	\$90,820,152.00
Budgeted for teachers' salaries, 1932-33	-----	83,004,730.76

Reduction	-----	\$7,815,421.24 or 8.6%
-----------	-------	------------------------

### Reduction in Expenditures in 1931-32

In order to secure a complete picture of the total reductions effected in school costs during the past two years the reductions made in actual district expenditures for 1931-32 as compared with the expenditures for 1930-31, should be taken into consideration. The total expenditures of the school districts in 1930-31 amounted to \$153,334,669.00. The expenditures of the same districts for 1931-32 amounted



to \$143,339,481.00. Thus, during 1931-32 there was an actual reduction in expenditures amounting to \$9,995,188.00 or a reduction of 6.5%.

When the amount of the expenditure reduction of 1931-32 is added to the budget reduction of 1932-33 the total reduction for the biennium is secured. This total is \$58,762,761.98.

### Capital Outlay Reductions

It should be pointed out that a considerable part of the total school district budget reductions of the past two years has been effected by postponement or abandonment of plans for new buildings, sites, and equipment. Of the total reduction in district expenditures between 1930-31 and 1931-32, \$8,060,562.93 or 80.6% of the total reduction was accounted for by reduction in capital outlay expenditures.

In attempting to estimate what portion of the school district budget reductions of the current school year represents further curtailment in capital outlay programs, we are limited to a comparison of the amounts budgeted for this year with the amounts actually expended last year. These figures are not directly and exactly comparable, but the difference represents the minimum reduction in capital outlay expenditures. If the total amounts budgeted for capital outlays are not expended within this fiscal year, the capital outlay reduction will be greater than estimated.

The following statement gives comparative data showing the amounts and percentages of reduction in capital outlay costs, by divisions of the school system, and for the total of all districts in the state:

#### *Elementary School Districts*

Capital outlays, 1931-32-----	\$6,651,056.77
Budgeted, 1932-33-----	2,349,942.16

Reduction ----- \$4,301,114.61 or 64.7%

#### *High School Districts*

Capital outlays, 1931-32-----	\$8,352,781.16
Budgeted, 1932-33-----	1,939,604.54

Reduction ----- \$6,413,176.62 or 76.8%

#### *Junior College Districts*

Capital outlays, 1931-32-----	\$1,111,011.44
Budgeted, 1932-33-----	591,273.00

Reduction ----- \$519,738.44 or 46.8%

#### *Total—All Districts*

Capital outlays, 1931-32-----	\$16,114,849.37
Budgeted, 1932-33-----	4,880,819.70

Reduction ----- \$11,234,029.67 or 69.7%

Thus, of the total budget reduction of \$48,767,573.98, effected this year, \$11,234,029.67, or 33.0%, represents curtailment of the capital outlay program. The balance of the reduction, totaling \$37,533,544.31, is in current expenditures, including salaries, instructional cost, and operation and maintenance costs.



TABLE No. 1

Total Receipts of All School Districts, by Types of Districts and by Counties, 1931-32

Counties	Elementary school districts	High school districts	Junior college districts	Total
Alameda.....	\$6,324,123 69	\$6,827,555 47		\$13,151,679 16
Alpine.....	16,643 74			16,643 74
Amador.....	113,886 25	88,954 56		202,840 81
Butte.....	472,428 62	443,192 19		915,620 81
Calaveras.....	119,490 60	85,172 70		204,663 30
Colusa.....	197,918 50	221,736 66		419,655 16
Contra Costa.....	1,395,376 20	1,368,081 33		2,763,457 53
Del Norte.....	75,034 66	65,119 91		140,154 57
El Dorado.....	136,466 59	73,636 12		210,102 71
Fresno.....	2,149,937 03	2,080,602 50		4,230,539 53
Glenn.....	191,350 33	174,637 95		365,988 28
Humboldt.....	676,781 60	607,644 23		1,284,425 83
Imperial.....	792,681 31	545,549 93		1,338,231 24
Inyo.....	133,240 51	121,019 30		254,259 81
Kern.....	2,273,827 03	1,649,261 02		3,923,088 05
Kings.....	489,528 63	350,119 34		839,647 97
Lake.....	134,763 11	129,585 59		264,348 70
Lassen.....	211,029 66	171,731 34		382,761 00
Los Angeles.....	39,833,343 25	35,482,388 64	\$2,073,003 61	78,088,735 50
Madera.....	376,585 74	278,951 24		655,536 98
Marin.....	454,338 97	429,747 25	149,953 95	1,034,040 17
Mariposa.....	66,795 87	40,506 71		107,302 58
Mendocino.....	405,813 70	327,675 98		733,489 68
Merced.....	622,761 49	473,404 77		1,096,166 26
Modoc.....	132,731 35	96,820 12		229,551 47
Mono.....	35,266 95			35,266 95
Monterey.....	1,061,165 79	796,061 76		1,857,227 55
Napa.....	400,587 75	236,008 51		636,596 26
Nevada.....	146,119 66	90,199 97		236,319 63
Orange.....	2,395,930 80	1,884,079 39	381,116 22	4,661,126 41
Placer.....	383,436 12	345,630 45		729,066 57
Plumas.....	139,461 01	94,854 32		234,315 33
Riverside.....	1,252,749 04	1,048,482 35	203,794 96	2,505,026 35
Sacramento.....	2,050,379 35	1,973,149 85	322,259 20	4,345,788 40
San Benito.....	191,485 13	158,811 50		350,296 63
San Bernardino.....	2,045,376 70	1,470,240 24	403,770 28	3,919,387 22
San Diego.....	2,663,196 41	2,555,259 52		5,218,455 93
San Francisco.....	6,441,357 16	5,490,357 57		11,931,714 73
San Joaquin.....	1,690,878 94	1,060,554 78		2,751,433 72
San Luis Obispo.....	548,053 85	436,496 52		984,550 37
San Mateo.....	1,226,006 98	956,693 69	294,866 89	2,477,567 56
Santa Barbara.....	1,550,801 62	1,680,424 61		3,231,226 23
Santa Clara.....	2,084,657 66	1,980,499 80	166,566 91	4,231,724 37
Santa Cruz.....	476,783 85	431,784 64		908,568 49
Shasta.....	272,214 76	226,528 16		498,742 92
Sierra.....	33,283 13	31,623 67		64,906 80
Siskiyou.....	373,382 49	285,440 82		658,823 31
Solano.....	506,992 33	667,143 33		1,174,135 66
Sonoma.....	808,676 94	672,647 06	140,014 44	1,621,338 44
Stanislaus.....	826,363 51	700,334 15	248,763 85	1,775,461 51
Sutter.....	325,240 37	224,961 19		550,201 56
Tehama.....	218,196 33	168,551 10		386,747 43
Trinity.....	58,222 17	19,907 22		78,129 39
Tulare.....	1,232,327 79	1,170,006 76		2,402,334 55
Tuolumne.....	137,999 07	100,854 48		238,853 55
Ventura.....	1,318,617 38	1,092,318 95		2,410,936 33
Yolo.....	380,848 57	291,572 92		672,421 49
Yuba.....	183,296 01	132,908 65	58,087 76	374,292 42
Totals.....	\$91,356,234 05	\$80,491,112 78	\$5,042,198 07	\$176,889,544 90

TABLE No. 2

**Aggregate Amount Budgeted by All Elementary School Districts for  
Elementary School and Kindergarten Purposes, by Counties, 1932-33**

Counties	Teachers' salaries	All current expenses	Capital outlays	Total budgeted by elementary school districts
Alameda.....	\$3,852,267 39	\$5,049,968 66	\$200,046 35	\$5,250,015 01
Alpine.....	3,960 00	6,824 30	1,476 00	8,300 30
Amador.....	59,439 50	77,224 00	1,540 00	78,764 00
Butte.....	296,192 00	404,109 69	13,878 95	417,188 64
Calaveras.....	55,327 00	69,395 00	341 00	69,736 00
Colusa.....	86,714 00	125,320 00	1,487 00	126,807 00
Contra Costa.....	651,228 00	981,084 00	41,060 00	1,022,144 00
Del Norte.....	34,215 00	51,104 70		51,104 70
El Dorado.....	92,043 00	113,923 00	4,093 00	118,016 00
Fresno.....	1,186,812 00	1,732,028 00	54,822 00	1,786,850 00
Glenn.....	101,076 40	145,100 50	5,615 00	150,715 50
Humboldt.....	348,808 50	468,311 33	47,774 01	516,085 34
Imperial.....	479,921 08	692,768 35	42,856 92	735,625 27
Inyo.....	59,598 00	101,014 00	2,620 00	103,634 00
Kern.....	996,724 00	1,595,029 00	135,604 00	1,730,633 00
Kings.....	224,960 00	292,955 00	52,745 00	345,700 00
Lake.....	64,102 00	96,127 00	3,123 00	99,250 00
Lassen.....	102,013 75	150,796 25	1,700 00	152,496 25
Los Angeles.....	16,170,484 00	25,529,772 00	812,621 00	26,342,393 00
Madera.....	167,297 00	266,246 00	12,352 00	278,598 00
Marin.....	246,482 40	376,851 33	18,911 84	395,763 17
Mariposa.....	38,945 00	55,261 10	2,312 54	57,573 64
Mendocino.....	196,082 00	293,504 82	919 00	294,423 82
Merced.....	318,064 00	483,520 50	14,379 74	497,900 24
Modoc.....	72,606 36	102,327 22	1,000 00	103,327 22
Mono.....	14,660 00	23,793 50	1,885 00	25,678 50
Monterey.....	487,929 48	700,091 52	21,851 61	721,943 13
Napa.....	154,179 00	211,434 00	4,495 00	215,929 00
Nevada.....	88,917 00	116,820 00	1,925 00	118,745 00
Orange.....	1,118,205 00	1,554,230 00	96,500 00	1,650,730 00
Placer.....	224,284 00	301,536 00	17,666 00	319,202 00
Plumas.....	58,135 00	86,332 00	6,006 00	92,338 00
Riverside.....	631,719 00	909,247 00	50,860 00	960,107 00
Sacramento.....	1,218,384 00	1,660,563 96	103,779 27	1,764,343 23
San Benito.....	107,637 00	152,722 92	75 00	152,797 92
San Bernardino.....	924,232 00	1,380,510 00	54,530 00	1,435,040 00
San Diego.....	1,388,905 00	2,100,649 58	83,474 19	2,184,123 77
San Francisco.....	3,621,964 81	5,082,890 48	28,823 69	5,111,714 17
San Joaquin.....	895,622 25	1,163,952 70	41,856 00	1,205,808 70
San Luis Obispo.....	209,491 50	417,457 98	16,281 60	433,739 58
San Mateo.....	641,526 00	869,145 00	37,335 00	906,480 00
Santa Barbara.....	531,832 01	886,631 06	56,301 00	942,932 06
Santa Clara.....	1,180,172 80	1,729,504 68	44,588 05	1,774,092 73
Santa Cruz.....	254,498 00	373,831 21	21,902 00	395,733 21
Shasta.....	148,706 00	206,760 00	6,779 00	216,539 00
Sierra.....	19,590 00	26,317 00	1,650 00	27,967 00
Siakiyou.....	231,932 00	298,209 00	1,412 00	299,621 00
Solano.....	250,821 00	372,252 00	6,739 00	378,991 00
Sonoma.....	452,420 00	611,878 00	8,452 00	620,330 00
Stanislaus.....	440,655 60	608,360 18	10,615 00	618,975 18
Sutter.....	121,103 40	178,717 40	1,664 72	180,382 12
Tehama.....	123,663 00	170,692 00	2,981 00	173,673 00
Trinity.....	33,120 00	44,056 00	1,413 00	45,469 00
Tulare.....	630,629 00	884,314 80	39,066 60	923,381 40
Tuolumne.....	75,970 00	99,929 95	1,150 00	101,079 95
Ventura.....	515,389 50	800,996 29	51,903 08	852,899 37
Yolo.....	194,688 00	282,773 00	16,279 00	299,052 00
Yuba.....	96,667 00	125,825 50	36,425 00	162,250 50
Totals.....	\$43,053,010 73	\$63,695,990 46	\$2,349,942 16	\$66,045,932 62

TABLE No. 3

Aggregate Amount Budgeted by All High School Districts, for the Support of High Schools During the Current Year, by Counties, 1932-33

Counties	Teachers salaries	All current expenses	Capital outlays	Total budgeted by high school districts
Alameda.....	\$4,172,726 66	\$5,558,860 44	\$220,993 25	\$5,779,583 69
Alpine.....	43,900 00	63,538 25	940 00	64,478 25
Amador.....	195,336 00	301,869 28	19,890 30	321,755 58
Butte.....	33,010 00	59,605 00	400 00	60,005 00
Calaveras.....	85,442 50	143,689 13	4,460 00	148,149 13
Colusa.....	617,705 00	900,199 00	50,479 00	950,673 00
Contra Costa.....	19,000 00	38,725 00	650 00	39,375 00
Del Norte.....	36,202 00	62,272 00	250 00	62,522 00
El Dorado.....	1,099,095 00	1,638,942 00	91,625 00	1,730,567 00
Fresno.....	84,070 00	118,800 00	3,950 00	122,750 00
Glean.....	216,095 00	333,395 00	19,879 93	353,274 93
Humboldt.....	226,150 17	397,172 97	26,970 00	424,142 97
Imperial.....	56,335 00	98,133 00	6,373 00	104,506 00
Inyo.....	659,592 00	1,099,618 00	71,410 00	1,171,028 00
Kern.....	148,255 00	254,771 00	7,795 00	262,566 00
Kings.....	58,170 00	84,686 00	1,140 00	85,826 00
Lake.....	83,000 00	123,755 00	5,230 00	128,985 00
Lauren.....	15,689,515 00	23,245,828 00	694,304 00	23,939,832 00
Los Angeles.....	74,921 00	129,044 00	3,300 00	132,344 00
Madera.....	241,288 75	389,408 23	20,400 00	409,898 23
Marin.....	16,550 00	35,000 00	3,500 00	38,500 00
Mariposa.....	151,820 00	279,400 00	2,650 00	282,050 00
Mendocino.....	226,493 00	353,093 00	42,550 00	395,643 00
Merced.....	49,630 00	79,635 00	1,100 00	80,735 00
Modoc.....	298,357 36	531,561 84	28,650 00	560,211 84
Mono.....	92,315 00	140,215 00	1,950 00	142,165 00
Monterey.....	53,172 00	75,595 00	6,399 00	81,994 00
Napa.....	873,245 00	1,405,883 00	99,304 00	1,505,187 00
Nevada.....	143,571 00	227,369 00	4,915 00	232,284 00
Orange.....	42,490 00	75,190 00	3,000 00	78,190 00
Placer.....	503,449 00	777,831 00	28,841 00	806,672 00
Plumas.....	734,828 00	1,132,505 26	22,831 75	1,155,337 01
Riverside.....	53,632 00	92,048 74	1,500 00	93,548 74
Sacramento.....	732,485 00	1,059,598 00	35,975 00	1,095,573 00
San Benito.....	1,387,135 00	1,976,918 10	41,345 00	2,018,263 10
San Bernardino.....	3,228,550 19	4,432,551 17	18,176 31	4,450,727 48
San Diego.....	537,862 50	764,794 00	19,650 00	784,444 00
San Francisco.....	187,215 00	321,045 50	34,527 00	355,572 50
San Joaquin.....	474,255 00	692,939 00	35,880 00	728,819 00
San Luis Obispo.....	528,683 49	1,116,567 65	39,084 50	1,155,662 15
San Mateo.....	1,129,308 00	1,524,138 00	42,172 50	1,566,310 50
Santa Barbara.....	234,813 10	347,951 20	17,554 00	365,505 20
Santa Clara.....	81,170 00	142,883 00	3,766 00	146,649 00
Santa Cruz.....	17,300 00	25,875 00	750 00	26,625 00
Shasta.....	146,219 00	222,899 00	6,457 00	229,356 00
Sierra.....	230,300 00	333,344 00	28,412 00	361,756 00
Shasta.....	361,203 00	526,026 00	15,700 00	541,726 00
Sierra.....	270,130 50	490,971 96	16,763 00	507,734 96
Stanislaus.....	101,817 00	156,381 00	11,300 00	167,681 00
Sutter.....	81,870 00	134,401 50	8,084 00	142,485 50
Tehama.....	9,360 00	16,560 00	960 00	17,520 00
Trinity.....	403,440 31	616,810 31	16,595 00	633,405 31
Tulare.....	45,250 00	82,080 00	1,100 00	83,180 00
Tuolumne.....	400,862 50	636,053 23	37,468 00	673,521 23
Ventura.....	129,130 00	201,715 00	6,545 00	208,260 00
Yolo.....	55,633 00	87,768 00	3,710 00	91,468 00
Yuba.....				
Totals.....	\$37,853,344 03	\$56,157,598 76	\$1,939,604 54	\$55,097,203 30

TABLE No. 4

Aggregate Amount Budgeted by All Junior College Districts, by Counties, 1932-33

Counties	Teachers salaries	All current expenses	Capital outlays	Total budgeted by junior college districts
Alameda.....				
Alpine.....				
Amador.....				
Butte.....				
Calaveras.....				
Colusa.....				
Contra Costa.....				
Del Norte.....				
El Dorado.....				
Fresno.....				
Glenn.....				
Humboldt.....				
Imperial.....				
Inyo.....				
Kern.....				
Kings.....				
Lake.....				
Lassen.....				
Los Angeles.....	\$941,069 00	\$1,658,238 00	\$450,383 00	\$2,117,631 00
Madera.....				
Marin.....	64,600 00	105,987 21	12,000 00	117,987 21
Mariposa.....				
Mendocino.....				
Merced.....				
Modoc.....				
Mono.....				
Monterey.....				
Napa.....				
Nevada.....				
Orange.....	156,212 00	316,358 00	1,252 00	317,610 00
Placer.....				
Plumas.....				
Riverside.....	89,000 00	119,747 00	9,928 00	129,675 00
Sacramento.....	211,737 00	288,877 29	11,683 00	300,560 29
San Benito.....				
San Bernardino.....	165,987 00	277,917 00	34,125 00	312,042 00
San Diego.....				
San Francisco.....				
San Joaquin.....				
San Luis Obispo.....				
San Mateo.....	140,810 00	184,164 00	7,279 00	191,443 00
Santa Barbara.....				
Santa Clara.....	138,000 00	161,000 00	10,000 00	171,000 00
Santa Cruz.....				
Shasta.....				
Sierra.....				
Siskiyou.....				
Solano.....				
Sonoma.....	46,000 00	71,500 00	25,813 00	97,313 00
Stanislaus.....	110,483 00	151,365 50	19,800 00	171,165 50
Sutter.....				
Tehama.....				
Trinity.....				
Tulare.....				
Tuolumne.....				
Ventura.....				
Yolo.....				
Yuba.....	34,478 00	52,408 00		52,408 00
Totals.....	\$2,098,376 00	\$3,387,562 00	\$591,273 00	\$3,978,835 00

TABLE No. 5

Aggregate Amount Budgeted by All School Districts, by Counties,  
1932-33

Counties	Teachers salaries	All current expenses	Capital outlays	Total budgeted by all districts
Alameda.....	\$8,024,994 05	\$10,608,829 10	\$421,039 60	\$11,029,868 70
Alpine.....	3,960 00	6,824 30	1,476 00	8,300 30
Amador.....	103,339 50	140,762 25	2,490 00	143,242 25
Butte.....	491,528 00	705,978 97	33,769 25	739,748 22
Calaveras.....	88,337 00	129,000 00	741 00	129,741 00
Colusa.....	172,156 50	269,009 13	5,947 00	274,956 13
Contra Costa.....	1,268,933 00	1,881,283 00	91,539 00	1,972,822 00
De Norte.....	53,215 00	89,829 70	650 00	90,479 70
El Dorado.....	128,245 00	176,195 00	4,343 00	180,538 00
Fresno.....	2,285,907 00	3,370,970 00	146,447 00	3,517,417 00
Glenn.....	185,146 40	263,900 50	9,565 00	273,465 50
Humboldt.....	564,503 50	801,706 33	67,653 94	869,360 27
Imperial.....	706,071 25	1,089,941 32	69,826 92	1,159,768 24
Inyo.....	115,933 00	199,147 00	8,993 00	208,140 00
Kern.....	1,656,316 00	2,694,647 00	207,014 00	2,901,661 00
Kings.....	373,215 00	547,726 00	60,540 00	608,266 00
Lake.....	122,272 00	180,813 00	4,263 00	185,076 00
Lassen.....	185,013 75	274,551 25	6,930 00	281,481 25
Los Angeles.....	32,801,068 00	50,433,538 00	1,966,318 00	52,399,856 00
Madera.....	242,218 00	395,290 00	15,652 00	410,942 00
Marin.....	552,371 15	872,246 77	51,311 84	923,558 61
Mariposa.....	55,495 00	90,261 10	5,812 54	96,073 64
Mendocino.....	347,902 00	572,904 82	3,569 00	576,473 82
Merced.....	544,557 00	836,613 50	56,929 74	893,543 24
Modoc.....	122,236 36	181,962 22	2,100 00	184,062 22
Mono.....	14,660 00	23,793 50	1,885 00	25,678 50
Monterey.....	786,286 84	1,231,653 36	50,501 61	1,282,154 97
Napa.....	246,494 00	351,649 00	6,445 00	358,094 00
Nevada.....	142,089 00	192,4 5 00	8,324 00	200,739 00
Orange.....	2,147,662 00	3,276,471 00	197,056 00	3,473,527 00
Placer.....	367,855 00	528,905 00	22,581 00	551,486 00
Plumas.....	100,625 00	161,522 00	9,006 00	170,528 00
Riverside.....	1,224,168 00	1,806,825 00	89,629 00	1,896,454 00
Sacramento.....	2,164,949 00	3,081,946 51	138,294 02	3,220,240 53
San Benito.....	161,269 00	244,771 66	1,575 00	246,346 66
San Bernardino.....	1,822,704 00	2,718,025 00	124,630 00	2,842,655 00
San Diego.....	2,776,040 00	4,077,567 68	124,819 19	4,202,386 87
San Francisco.....	6,850,515 00	9,515,441 65	47,000 00	9,562,441 65
San Joaquin.....	1,433,474 75	1,928,746 70	61,506 00	1,990,252 70
San Luis Obispo.....	456,706 50	738,503 48	50,808 60	789,312 08
San Mateo.....	1,256,591 00	1,746,248 00	80,494 00	1,826,742 00
Santa Barbara.....	1,060,515 50	2,003,198 71	95,385 50	2,098,584 21
Santa Clara.....	2,447,480 80	3,414,642 68	96,760 55	3,511,403 23
Santa Cruz.....	489,311 10	721,782 41	39,456 00	761,238 41
Shasta.....	229,876 00	352,643 00	10,545 00	363,188 00
Sierra.....	36,890 00	52,192 00	2,400 00	54,592 00
Siakiyou.....	378,151 00	521,108 00	7,869 00	528,977 00
Solano.....	481,121 00	705,596 00	35,151 00	740,747 00
Sonoma.....	859,623 00	1,209,044 00	49,965 00	1,259,369 00
Stanislaus.....	821,269 10	1,250,697 64	47,178 00	1,297,875 64
Sutter.....	222,920 40	335,098 40	12,964 72	348,063 12
Tehama.....	205,533 00	305,093 50	11,065 00	316,158 50
Trinity.....	42,480 00	60,616 00	2,373 00	62,989 00
Tulare.....	1,034,069 31	1,501,125 11	55,661 60	1,556,786 71
Tuolumne.....	121,220 00	182,009 95	2,250 00	184,259 95
Ventura.....	916,252 00	1,437,049 52	89,271 08	1,526,420 60
Yolo.....	323,818 00	484,488 00	22,824 00	507,312 00
Yuba.....	186,778 00	265,991 50	40,135 00	306,126 50
Totals.....	\$83,004,730 75	\$123,241,151 22	\$4,880,819 70	\$128,121,970 92



TABLE No. 6

**Total Amount and Percentage of Reduction in School District Budgets for 1932-33 as Compared with Total Receipts of School Districts for 1931-32, by Types of School Districts and by Counties**

Counties	Reduction in 1932-1933 school district budgets									
	Elementary school districts		High school districts		Junior college districts		All school districts			
	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent
Alameda.....	\$1,074,108 68	17.0	\$1,047,701 78	15.3			\$2,121,810 46	16.1		
Alpine.....	8,343 44	50.1					8,343 44	50.1		
Amador.....	35,122 25	30.8	24,476 31	27.5			59,598 56	29.4		
Butte.....	54,439 98	11.5	121,432 61	27.4			175,872 59	19.2		
Calaveras.....	49,754 60	41.6	25,167 70	29.5			74,922 30	36.6		
Colusa.....	71,111 50	35.9	73,587 53	33.2			144,699 03	34.5		
Contra Costa.....	373,232 30	26.7	417,403 33	30.5			790,635 53	28.6		
Del Norte.....	23,929 96	31.9	25,744 91	39.5			49,674 87	35.4		
El Dorado.....	18,459 59	13.5	11,114 12	16.1			29,564 71	14.1		
Fresno.....	365,067 03	16.9	390,065 50	16.8			713,122 53	16.9		
Gleason.....	40,634 83	21.2	51,887 95	29.7			92,522 78	25.3		
Humboldt.....	160,634 26	23.7	254,369 30	41.9			415,055 56	32.3		
Imperial.....	57,909 04	7.2	121,406 90	22.3			178,463 00	13.3		
Inyo.....	29,000 51	22.2	17,113 30	14.1			46,719 81	15.3		
Kern.....	543,114 03	23.9	378,232 02	24.4			921,427 05	24.1		
King.....	143,929 63	29.4	87,553 34	25.0			231,381 97	27.6		
Lake.....	35,513 11	26.4	43,729 80	33.8			79,272 70	30.0		
Lassen.....	58,332 41	27.7	42,846 34	24.9			101,279 75	26.6		
Los Angeles.....	13,690,590 25	34.0	11,542,566 64	32.5	\$555,372 61	20.8	25,698,879 50	32.9		
Madera.....	97,367 74	26.0	146,567 24	52.6			244,554 98	37.3		
Marin.....	58,575 80	13.9	19,939 02	4.6			110,481 56	10.7		
Mariposa.....	9,222 23	13.8	2,004 71	5.0			11,226 94	10.5		
Monterey.....	111,389 88	27.4	45,695 99	13.9			157,015 86	21.4		
Mendocino.....	124,861 25	20.0	77,751 77	16.4			202,623 02	18.6		
Merced.....	29,404 13	22.2	16,086 12	10.6			45,489 25	19.8		
Modoc.....										
Mono.....	9,358 45	27.2					9,588 45	27.2		
Monterey.....	339,222 66	32.0	235,849 92	29.6			575,072 58	31.0		
Napa.....	184,658 75	46.1	93,943 51	39.8			278,592 26	43.7		
Neveda.....	27,374 06	18.7	8,205 87	9.1			35,580 63	15.1		
Orange.....	745,200 80	31.1	378,802 39	20.1	03,506 22	16.7	1,187,599 41	25.5		



Place.....	64,224 12	16.8	113,246 45	32.8	74,119 06	36.4	177,580 57	24.4
Plumas.....	47,123 01	33.8	10,964 32	17.6	17.6	65,782 33	65,782 33	27.2
Riverside.....	292,642 04	23.4	241,810 35	23.1	241,810 35	608,572 35	608,572 35	24.3
Sacramento.....	286,086 12	14.0	817,812 84	41.4	21,698 91	6.7	1,125,547 87	25.9
San Benito.....	38,687 21	20.2	65,202 76	41.1	21,698 91	6.7	103,940 97	29.7
San Bernardino.....	610,386 70	20.8	374,607 24	25.5	91,728 28	22.7	1,076,732 22	27.5
San Diego.....	479,072 64	18.0	836,596 42	21.0	21.0	1,016,069 06	1,016,069 06	19.5
San Francisco.....	1,326,642 99	20.6	1,039,630 09	18.9	18.9	2,362,273 08	2,362,273 08	19.9
San Joaquin.....	485,370 24	28.7	276,110 78	26.0	26.0	761,181 02	761,181 02	27.7
San Luis Obispo.....	114,314 27	20.9	80,924 02	18.5	18.5	196,238 26	196,238 26	19.8
San Mateo.....	319,526 98	26.1	227,874 69	23.8	103,423 89	35.1	680,525 56	26.3
Santa Barbara.....	607,869 56	39.2	524,772 46	31.2	31.2	1,132,642 02	1,132,642 02	35.1
Santa Clara.....	310,664 93	14.9	414,189 30	20.7	4,433 09	2.7	720,221 14	17.0
Santa Cruz.....	81,050 64	17.0	66,279 44	15.4	15.4	147,330 08	147,330 08	16.2
Shasta.....	56,675 70	20.5	79,279 16	35.3	35.3	135,554 92	135,554 92	27.2
Sierra.....	5316 13	16.0	4,998 67	15.8	15.8	10,314 50	10,314 50	15.9
Siaticou.....	73,701 49	19.8	39,084 52	14.6	14.6	112,846 31	112,846 31	17.6
Solano.....	128,001 33	25.2	305,387 33	45.8	45.8	433,388 66	433,388 66	36.9
Sonoma.....	188,346 94	23.3	130,921 06	19.5	42,701 44	30.5	361,969 44	22.3
Stanislaus.....	207,388 33	25.1	192,699 19	27.5	77,598 35	31.2	477,585 87	26.9
Sutter.....	144,868 25	44.5	57,280 19	25.5	25.5	202,138 44	202,138 44	36.7
Tehama.....	44,523 33	20.4	26,065 60	18.5	18.5	70,588 93	70,588 93	18.3
Trinity.....	12,763 17	21.9	2,387 22	12.0	12.0	15,140 30	15,140 30	19.4
Tulare.....	308,946 39	25.1	536,601 45	45.9	45.9	845,547 84	845,547 84	35.2
Tuolumne.....	36,919 12	26.8	17,704 48	17.5	17.5	54,623 60	54,623 60	22.9
Ventura.....	465,718 01	35.3	418,797 72	33.3	33.3	884,515 73	884,515 73	36.7
Yolo.....	81,795 57	21.5	83,312 92	28.6	28.6	105,109 49	105,109 49	24.6
Yuba.....	21,045 51	11.5	41,440 56	31.2	5,679 76	9.8	68,165 92	18.2
Net totals.....	\$23,310,301 43	27.7	\$22,363,909 48	27.8	\$1,083,303 07	21.1	\$48,767,573 98	27.6

\*Increase.

## Public Schools Week

VIERLING KERSEY, *Superintendent of Public Instruction*

The fourteenth annual observance of Public Schools Week will be held during the week commencing Monday, April 24, 1933. Public Schools Week originated in the crisis confronting education throughout the nation during 1919 and 1920. An even greater crisis confronts education today. The long continued economic depression has been the cause of severe retrenchments in school expenditures and drastic curtailments in school programs. Throughout the nation thousands of schools have been closed, and thousands of others have been forced to cut several months from the school term.

As yet schools in California have not been closed for lack of funds. This danger threatens in the immediate future, however. Records of school revenues for the present school year indicate very clearly that many districts have insufficient funds with which to operate schools for the last months of the present school term. A still larger number of districts will have no funds to operate schools for the first part of the next school year beginning July 1, 1933, and will be obliged to remain closed until the first apportionment of state school funds in September or to operate on registered warrants carrying 6 per cent interest.

The situation confronting education in California is a critical one. It is highly important that the people have adequate and authoritative information about their schools. The public schools are the people's schools. The welfare of education is a matter of primary concern to all citizens.

Public Schools Week offers an opportunity for the people to become better acquainted with the work of the schools, to learn the important facts about the present crisis in education, and to formulate their opinions with regard to immediate steps which are necessary to insure the continued welfare of public education. School officials should bend every effort to aid the public in constructive study of educational problems.

Much misunderstanding has arisen due to destructive criticism of the public schools based on inadequate knowledge and false information concerning actual conditions, and in certain instances because of opposition to the institution of public education.

Out of Public Schools Week should come an enlightened public opinion strengthened by a knowledge of facts about present conditions and united support of the purpose to keep our public schools free from harm.

## DEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATIONS

### Division of Research and Statistics

WALTER E. MORGAN, *Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction and Chief, Division of Research and Statistics.*

#### SCHOOL ATTENDANCE DURING THE BANK HOLIDAYS

Thursday and Friday, March 2 and 3, declared public holidays by proclamation of Governor James Rolph, Jr., were also state school holidays requiring the closing of the public schools in accordance with the requirements of School Code section 3.90. These days therefore should be recorded as state school holidays in elementary school registers and in secondary school attendance records. Attendance on these days should not be counted, and the days should not be included in the "total days taught" employed as a divisor, in computing average daily attendance.

Beginning Monday, March 6, bank holidays proclaimed by the Governor, will not be construed as state school holidays, since School Code section 3.90 and Political Code section 10 were amended by the Legislature on Friday, March 3, so as to exempt the schools from such special bank holidays. These amendments were urgency measures, signed by the Governor Saturday, March 4, and became immediately effective. The schools, therefore, were not required to be closed during the bank holidays beginning Monday, March 6, and attendance should be regularly counted during such bank holidays.

#### ACCELERATION-RETARDATION REPORTS

In order to cooperate with local school districts in the conservation of school funds for essential school services, the State Department of Education will not this year require reports of acceleration and retardation of pupils in elementary and high schools.

#### FINAL APPORTIONMENT OF STATE SCHOOL FUNDS

The second and final apportionment of the State (elementary) School Fund and the State High School Fund for the school year 1932-33 was made under date of February 20, 1933. The apportionment included \$4,087,610 for elementary schools and \$6,254,470 for high schools. The elementary school apportionment provided \$5.9387+ for each of the 688,297 units of average daily attendance in elementary schools. The high school apportionment was at the rate of \$23.9216+ per unit of average daily attendance on the total of 261,456 units.

No amount was included in the February apportionment for district junior colleges since the total amount available in the State Junior College Fund was apportioned in September, 1932.

The following brief statement presents a summary of the apportionment of state school funds for elementary school, high school, and junior college districts for the current school year.

#### *Elementary School Districts*

23,659 teacher units at \$700 per unit-----	\$16,561,300 00
688,297 units of average daily attendance at \$5.9387299+ per unit -----	4,087,610 00
Excess cost of educating physically handicapped children-----	213,898 78
<b>Total apportionment for elementary schools, 1932-33-----</b>	<b>\$20,862,808 78</b>

#### *High School Districts*

1937 years maintained at \$550 per year-----	\$1,065,350 00
Three new high school districts at \$2,200-----	6,600 00
Special day and evening classes—	
“Bonus” on first 30 units of average daily attendance in special day and evening classes and evening schools, including compulsory continuation classes -----	\$517,260 00
Total average daily attendance: 24,639 units at \$23.9216923+ per unit-----	589,406 59
<b>Total apportionment on special day and evening classes</b>	<b>\$1,106,666 59</b>
Total average daily attendance, less average daily attendance in special day and evening classes: 236,817 units at \$23.9216923+ per unit-----	5,665,063 41
Excess cost of educating physically handicapped children-----	30,955 45
<b>Total apportionment for high schools, 1932-33-----</b>	<b>\$7,874,635 45</b>

#### *Junior College Districts*

17 district junior colleges at \$2,000-----	\$34,000 00
15,693 units of average daily attendance at \$87.180356+ per unit-----	1,368,121 33
<b>Total apportionment for district junior colleges, 1932-33 -----</b>	<b>\$1,402,121 33</b>

## **Division of Textbooks and Publications**

IVAN R. WATERMAN, Chief

### **NEW PUBLICATIONS**

The first three numbers of the *Department of Education Bulletin* for 1933, announced in previous issues of *California Schools*, have been somewhat delayed in printing. Numbers 1 and 2 are now available. Number 3, February 1, 1933, *Directory of California Secondary Schools*, is further delayed but should be available within a few weeks.

The following new publications are announced at this time although they will not be available until several weeks after the date of the bulletin:

*California Journal of Elementary Education*, Volume I, No. 3, February, 1933.

*Department of Education Bulletin*, No. 4, February 15, 1933. *Job Analysis of Police Service*

This study is a comprehensive analysis of police service under the organization found in Los Angeles, California. The various skills and essential knowledge required in connection with the many assignments of the several divisions of police service are given in detail.

*Department of Education Bulletin*, No. 5, March 1, 1933. *Suggestions for Public Schools Week, April 24 to 29, 1933*

This bulletin presents a brief discussion of certain major educational problems which have become acute during this critical period. It is intended to serve as an aid to both educators and lay leaders planning programs for Public Schools Week and endeavors to place emphasis on those issues which are most directly related to the future welfare of the state educational system.

## **Commission for Vocational Education**

### **Bureau of Agricultural Education**

JULIAN A. MCPHEE, Chief

#### **PRIZE LIVE STOCK GIVEN EDUCATION PROGRAM**

Three prize-winning Hampshire boars were recently given to the agricultural education program in California by the Fox Film Corporation, which had purchased the animals for use in filming the picture *State Fair*. In a ceremony on the Fox lot, Julian A. McPhee, Chief of the State Bureau of Agricultural Education, accepted the high-quality live stock. "Blue Boy," grand champion boar at the 1932 Iowa State Fair, was reserved for the use of all the future farmers in California and allocated to the care of the California Polytechnic School. Incidentally, "Blue Boy" is the featured animal in the picture and is destined to become probably the best-known hog in America. "Judge Dike," another prize winner at the same fair, was allocated to the Future Farmer chapter at the Chino Vocational School, California Junior Republic, where courses are carried on under the supervision of the State Bureau of Agricultural Education. "Bell Boy," the third animal, was given to the McKinley Home, at Van Nuys, where school work is conducted under the Los Angeles city system.

### **AGRICULTURE ENROLLMENTS INCREASE**

The average enrollment in high school vocational agriculture courses has increased at an average of 7.5 per cent, or 372 students, each year for the last 14 years, according to a recent study made by Julian A. McPhee, Chief of the State Bureau of Agricultural Education. Some of the other interesting facts disclosed in the survey are that of the 41,153 boys between the ages of 14 and 20 living on California farms, but 14.5 per cent are studying vocational agriculture in high schools; that of 6,404 students formerly taking vocational agriculture, 69 per cent are engaged in farming or allied occupations and 566, or 8.7 per cent, are in college, most of them continuing agricultural education; that high school vocational agriculture is taught in 127 rural high schools distributed in 43 counties; and that the average number of students per department last year was 45.9

### **STUDENTS USE MASS BUYING POWER**

High school vocational agriculture students at the Riverdale High School operate the state's largest student cooperative venture in live stock feed. Up to January 1, 1932, the feed-buying and -selling unit operated by the Future Farmers of America chapter of Riverdale High School had purchased and handled 195 tons of feed, most of it purchased for poultry- and pork-production projects of the students. The chapter expects to handle 250 tons or more by the end of the school year—involving receipts and disbursements of between \$4,000 and \$5,000. The feed is stored in a special building, is ground by the students in their own mill, and distributed at cost. A considerable reduction in the expense of live stock, poultry, and egg production, in addition to education in the management of a cooperative venture, is effected in this way.

### **MOTION PICTURES IN PREPARATION**

A motion picture film showing the individual project work and other activities of the high school vocational agriculture students is nearing completion and will be ready for showing some time in March. Activities include the camp schools conducted at the State Fair and the Los Angeles county fair, showings at the various live stock exhibitions, and the work of students in many sections of the state. The schedule for showing will be made up by the State Bureau of Agricultural Education, through State Supervisor Julian A. McPhee and the regional supervisors of agricultural education.



# INTERPRETATIONS OF SCHOOL LAW

## Appellate Court Decisions

### Injuries to Pupils

A school district is not liable under Deering Act 5619 (page 377, 1931 School Code) for injuries received by a pupil through an accidental collision with another pupil when, as members of a class in physical education composed of pupils in the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grades of an elementary school, the pupils were taking part, under the supervision of a teacher, in the running game known as "Black Man" or "King King Calico," the game not being inherently dangerous.

(*Ellis vs. Burns Valley School District etc.*, 72 C. A. D. 182, --- Pac. ----)

### School District Property

When a school district under a mistake of fact accepted real property and, for a period of twenty years, used the property for school purposes, its possession of the property was open and adverse, and the school district acquired title to the property by adverse possession. Section 325 of the Code of Civil Procedure requiring a party seeking to establish adverse possession of property to show that he has paid taxes thereon for five years is not applicable, since under Article XIII, section 1 of the Constitution, the property was exempt from taxation from the time the school district began its use thereof.

(*Mings vs. Compton City School District etc.*, 73 C. A. D. 634, --- Pac. ----)

## Attorney General's Opinions

### Amendments to Tenure Law

The Legislature may adopt an amendment to the Tenure Law which would be applicable to teachers who had not, at the time the amendment became effective, been classified as teachers with permanent tenure. There might be some question of the right of the Legislature to affect the status of teachers who had already been classified as permanent teachers. (A. G. O. 8436, January 25, 1933.)

**Balance in School District Building Fund**

School Code section 4.300 does not authorize the transfer of the balance left at the close of a fiscal year in the building fund of a district, which fund had been raised by a special tax for that purpose, to the general fund of the county. (A. G. O. 8437, January 21, 1933.)

**Liability for Bonded Indebtedness**

Where territory is taken from "A" district which has incurred the maximum bonded indebtedness permitted by School Code section 4.970 and is added to "B" district which has also incurred the maximum bonded indebtedness permitted by School Code section 4.970, "B" district is liable for the proportionate share of the bonded indebtedness of "A" district as was incurred for the acquisition and improvement of school lots or buildings or fixtures situated in the territory and "A" district is relieved of such liability. (A. G. O. 8439, February 2, 1933.)

**Purchase of Physical Education Apparel and Equipment**

The governing board of a school district may purchase with district funds clothing and equipment of a general nature used by pupils in courses in physical education which are compulsory under the laws of this state, but may not, as heretofore held in opinion No. 7822 of the Attorney General, purchase clothing and equipment for pupils enrolled in optional physical educational courses. (A. G. O. 8427, January 13, 1933.)

**Refunding of School District Bonds**

School district bond issues may be refunded under the authority of School Code section 4.960. (A. G. O. 8456, February 1, 1933.)

**Suits Against School Districts**

It is the duty of a district attorney to defend a school district in his county in damage suits against the district under Political Code section 4153 and section 2 of Chapter 1167, Statutes of 1931 (page 355, 1931 School Code). (A. G. O. 8465, February 8, 1933.)

## FOR YOUR INFORMATION

### STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING

The next regular quarterly meeting of the State Board of Education will be held in San Jose, April 7 and 8, 1933.

### DR. ALBERT EDWARD WINSHIP PASSES

The educational profession deeply mourns the passing of Dr. Albert Edward Winship, editor of the *Journal of Education* and author of several books dealing with various phases of education. Dr. Winship occupied many positions of importance in the educational world and his influence has been felt for years by educational leaders throughout the United States.

### SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS CONVENTION

The 1933 Secondary School Principals Convention will be held in San Jose on April 10, 11, and 12. The convention program includes in addition to general sessions, a series of section meetings which will provide junior high school, senior high school, four-year high school, six-year high school, evening high school, continuation high school, and junior college principals the opportunity to participate in the discussion of the fundamental principles involved in the unification of the secondary education program. Eight section meetings will be held on Tuesday morning, eight on Tuesday afternoon, and eight on Wednesday morning.

Topics for discussion in the section meetings are as follows:

Tuesday morning: New Procedure in Secondary Education Based on Sound Purposes.

Tuesday afternoon: Economies in Secondary Education Consistent with Acceptable Principles.

Wednesday morning: Public Relations in Terms of Immediate Needs.

The procedure to be followed in the section meetings will consist of first, a presentation of the subject; second, a discussion of the presentation by a selected panel of ten principals to whom will be forwarded in advance a mimeographed copy of the presentation of the topic; and third, general discussion.

Following is a tentative schedule of the convention.

### CONVENTION SCHEDULE

Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday
A.M. 7:30		Breakfast California Society of Secondary Education	Breakfasts California Federa- tion of Junior Colleges Radio Education
A.M. 9:30 to 11:45	General Session	Eight Section Meet- ings. Topic: New Procedures and Practices in Secondary Education  Legislative Committee Meeting	Eight Section Meet- ings. Topic: Public Relations in Terms of Immediate Needs  Legislative Committee Meeting
Noon 12:00 to 2:00	Luncheons  Phi Delta Kappa  Pi Lambda Theta  American Legion	Luncheon  California Con- gress of Parents and Teachers	Luncheons  Legislative Com- mittee
P.M. 2:30 to 4:45	General Session  Legislative Committee Meeting	Eight Section Meet- ings. Topic: Economies in Secondary Education	General Session  Committee Reports  Business Meeting
Evening	College Dinners, 6:30-8:30 University of Califor- nia Stanford University University of South- ern California  Reception 9:00	Association Dinner 6:30	

### Teacher Exchange Service

Because of the acute situation existing with respect to probable release of many secondary school teachers because of the reluctance of governing boards to classify them as permanent employees, provision

will be made at the convention for a teacher exchange service. A desk at the convention will be provided for this service in charge of Mrs. Evelyn Clement, Chief of the Division of Teacher Training and Certification. Principals are asked to register at this desk the names of teachers, who in their judgment are worthy to be retained by the district and whom they would recommend for continued work, but who will probably be released by the board to avoid their classification as permanent employees. It is hoped that this service will be of mutual benefit to principals and worthy teachers.

### NATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL CONFERENCE ORGANIZED

The American Association for Adult Education, through its Director, Morse A. Cartwright, announces the formation of the National Occupational Conference, an organization which will act as a clearing house for information in the field of occupational education and adjustment, functioning under the direction of the association. The conference plans to make occupational information based on studies and research more generally available than at present, both to educators and to young people and their parents, to prevent duplication of effort in occupational study and research and to maintain high standards of performance in making occupational studies. An appropriation of \$33,000 for the maintenance of the organization for the remainder of the fiscal year to October 1 has been made by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Headquarters offices have been opened at 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

In detail the program of the conference will include the maintenance of a clearing house for occupational information; the origination or compilation, from the studies of other agencies, of comprehensive occupational studies at all educational levels; the distribution of such studies and of other materials relating to occupational education and adjustment; the stimulation and possible support of further research and inquiry in those occupations where such research seems necessary; the development of a program of publication designed to meet the needs of administrators, teachers, and students, public employment counselors and employed adults; the sponsorship or in rare cases the conduct of further studies and possibly some research in the field of occupational education and adjustment.

It is expected that the conference will cooperate with such organizations as the United States Office of Education, the Federal Board for Vocational Education, the American Vocational Association, the National Vocational Guidance Association, the National Education Association, the American Management Association and others.

Coincident with the formation of the conference the American Council on Education has appointed a Committee on Occupational Training and Adaptation, under the direction of Dr. Edward C. Elliott. This committee is independent of but will cooperate with the conference. Its chief interest is in evolving a program for a long time study and planning of occupational education.

### NATIONAL SURVEY OF SCHOOL FINANCE

In 1931, the Congress authorized a national survey of school finance to be conducted under the general direction of Wm. John Cooper, United States Commissioner of Education. Dr. Paul R. Mort, Director of Education of Teachers College, Columbia University, was engaged as Associate Director to assume immediate direction of the survey. It was contemplated that the survey would require four years to complete and plans were made accordingly. Soon after the survey was well under way, the Congress failed to make the necessary appropriation to continue the work. In spite of this severe handicap, the survey staff was able to complete certain parts of the survey and to publish a report. The first volume, *Bibliography on School Finance, 1923-1931*, published as *Bulletin 1932, No. 15 of the United States Office of Education*, has already appeared. Work on two additional volumes has just been completed. The first of these, *State Support of Public Education*, has just been published. The other volume *Needed Research in School Finance* will be published in the immediate future.

A few of the most significant findings from the study *State Support of Public Education*, as summarized by Dr. Mort, are as follows:

In most states the economic ability of the local school district determines the program of child welfare in the district; and in thousands of localities this ability is too low to provide proper care and education for children. There are vast areas, therefore, where schools are distinctly inferior and other areas where schools are ceasing to exist.

In most states there existed, even at the peak of prosperity, areas in which educational opportunities were of the most meagre type.

A century ago, when the battle to transfer the costs of education from individual parents to the whole local community was won and resulted in that system of free public education which became basic in American life and ideals, the local community was able to bear the burden. Drastic social change, however—especially that which has taken place during the last twenty-five years—not only has thrown greater responsibility upon public education in the rearing of healthy and law-abiding children but has seen the local community less and less able to bear the cost of this responsibility. Wealth has been concentrated in the great urban centers and in the hands of a relatively small number of persons.

A fundamental change required today is the transfer of the burden of support of education from local communities to the entire state.

The property tax is overburdened. More use must be made of other forms of taxation.



It is possible to have education financed by the individual state without removing control of teaching and the curriculum from the local community. It is recommended that the states set up satisfactory minimum programs of education which can be financed without throwing larger burdens upon any one local community than upon any other.

## EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTS

### Education at the Crossroads

The California State Department of Education is continuing the series of broadcasts on "Education at the Crossroads." These programs are broadcast at 6:30 p.m. on Saturday evenings over stations KPO, KECA, KGHL, KGIR, KJR, KGA.

March 4—LABOR'S INTEREST IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

Paul Scharrenberg, Secretary-Treasurer, California State Federation of Labor

March 11—SHOULD I SEND MY CHILD TO KINDERGARTEN?

Helen Heffernan, Chief, Division of Elementary Education and Rural Schools

March 18—WHY DO WE TEACH PHYSICAL EDUCATION?

N. P. Neilson, Chief, Division of Health and Physical Education

March 25—WHAT ARE THE PURPOSES OF HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION?

Nicholas Ricciardi, Chief, Division of Secondary Education

April 1—WHAT IS MEANT BY REHABILITATION EDUCATION?

H. D. Hicker, Chief, Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation

April 8—HOW PARENTS CAN HELP CHILDREN DEVELOP AN APPRECIATION OF MUSIC

Helen Heffernan, Chief, Division of Elementary Education and Rural Schools

April 15—ARE THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS PREPARING GIRLS TO TAKE THEIR PLACE IN HOME LIFE?

Maude I. Murchie, Chief, Bureau of Homemaking Education

April 22—WHAT ARE THE PURPOSES OF JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION?

Nicholas Ricciardi, Chief, Division of Secondary Education

April 29—ARE THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS PREPARING BOYS AND GIRLS TO BE EFFICIENT WORKERS?

J. C. Beswick, Chief, Bureau of Trade and Industrial Education and Ira W. Kibby, Chief, Bureau of Business Education

The following is the program for the State Department of Education broadcasts over station KQW on Tuesday evenings, at 7:15 p.m.:

March 7—CALIFORNIA'S PROBLEM OF RURAL EDUCATION

Helen Heffernan, Chief, Division of Elementary Education and Rural Schools

March 14—RESERVED. PROGRAM TO BE ARRANGED

March 21—WHAT MODERN YOUTH IS THINKING ABOUT PENDING SCHOOL LEGISLATION

Nicholas Ricciardi, Chief, Division of Secondary Education

March 28—WHY SUPERVISION IS NEEDED IN THE RURAL SCHOOLS

Helen Heffernan, Chief, Division of Elementary Education and Rural Schools

**April 4—WHY SHOULD WE TEACH AGRICULTURE?**

Julian A. McPhee, Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Education

**April 11—SERVICES WHICH THE DIVISION OF SCHOOLHOUSE PLANNING CAN RENDER TO THE RURAL SCHOOLS**

Andrew P. Hill, Chief, Division of Schoolhouse Planning

**April 18—WHAT IS HAPPENING IN A MODERN RURAL SCHOOL?**

Helen Heffernan, Chief, Division of Elementary Education and Rural Schools

**April 25—SOME SIGNIFICANT FACTS ABOUT TRANSPORTATION OF SCHOOL PUPILS**

C. F. Muncy, Assistant Chief, Division of Research and Statistics

**Our American Schools**

Continuing the series of radio programs over a nation-wide network of the National Broadcasting Company every Sunday from 3:30 to 4:00 p.m., Pacific Standard Time, the National Education Association, under the personal direction of Florence Hale, offers the following broadcasts for March and April. These broadcasts will be heard over Pacific Coast stations KPO, KGA, KJR, KEX, KECA, KFSD, KDYL, KGIR, KGHL.

**March 26—WHY SHOULD WE TEACH HOME ECONOMICS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS?**

Bess Goodykoontz, Assistant U. S. Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C.

**HOW SCHOOL TRAINING HELPS TO MAKE GOOD HOMES**

Lewis A. Wilson, Assistant State Commissioner of Education, Albany, N. Y.

**March 19—HEARSAY AND FACTS ABOUT EDUCATION**

S. D. Shankland, Executive Secretary, Department of Superintendence, National Education Association

**SAFEGUARDING THE EDUCATION OF OUR CHILDREN**

Patrick Campbell, Superintendent of Schools, Boston, Mass.

**April 2—PROLONGING LIFE THROUGH EDUCATION**

Louis I. Dublin, Chief Statistician, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, New York, N. Y.

**April 23—THE FORGOTTEN CHILD**

Mrs. Edith Joynea, Principal, George Washington School, Norfolk, Va.

**April 30—OH, THAT ARITHMETIC**

Garry Cleveland Myers, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

**WHY WE BELIEVE IN THE NEW KIND OF DISCIPLINE**

Willard Beatty, Superintendent of Schools, Bronxville, N. Y.

Programs subject to change without notice.

**University of California Radio Program**

Vocations for which the University offers training, Wednesdays, 9:45-10:00 a.m., over the KPO network.

**March 1—SANITARY ENGINEERING**

Professor C. G. Hyde

**March 8—TRANSPORTATION**

Professor Stuart Daggett

**March 15—EDUCATION**

Professor W. W. Kemp

**March 22—FORESTRY**

Professor F. S. Baker

**March 29—THE FOREIGN SERVICES**

Professor F. E. Hinckley.

### Speech Education

Mabel F. Gifford, Chief, Bureau of Correction of Speech Defects, California State Department of Education, will present the following program on Speech Education over station KYA, March 17, 24, 31 and April 7, at 11:45-12 noon:

March 17—**SPEECH DEFECTS AND DISORDERS AND THEIR TREATMENT**

Mabel F. Gifford, Chief of the Bureau of Correction of Speech Defects

March 24—**A CASE HISTORY OF A STAMMERER**

Ruth Clyde, Teacher of Speech Correction in the San Francisco Public Schools

March 31—**THE ARTICULATION DEFECTS IN SPEECH**

Veronica Dickey, Teacher in charge of Speech Correction in the Oakland Public Schools

April 7—**CALIFORNIA'S ACHIEVEMENT IN SPEECH**

Mabel F. Gifford, Chief of the Bureau of Correction of Speech Defects

### Vocational Agriculture Broadcasts

High school vocational agriculture students, under the direction of the Bureau of Agricultural Education of the State Department of Education present a monthly forty-five-minute broadcast over the western network of the National Broadcasting Company. These programs are heard from 12:15 to 1:00 p.m., the first Saturday of each month. Speakers are principally members of the Future Farmers of America, high school boys' vocational agriculture organization; agriculturalists; bankers; legislators; educators, and other prominent men in California; and members of the State Bureau of Agricultural Education staff and Smith-Hughes instructors. Timely news items from the 11 western states of Future Farmer and Smith-Hughes agriculture activities are included each month, the program being a western states activity. Music numbers by the National Broadcasting Company studio orchestra or high school music groups are included in the continuity of each program. The Future Farmers of America will recognize the anniversary of their first year of broadcasting on the March 4 program.

### CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON THE CRISIS IN EDUCATION

The Citizens Conference on the Crisis in Education, called by President Hoover to meet in Washington, D. C., January 5-6, 1933, consisted of 71 national leaders in various fields of activity. This group studied in intensive manner available facts with respect to the serious situation now confronting education throughout the nation, and formulated a set of 40 resolutions constituting a declaration of policy of the conference. These resolutions are highly constructive in nature

and point the way to a program of reconstruction in education for the immediate future.

In opening the conference, President Hoover stated:

Our nation faces the acute responsibility of providing a right of way for the American child. In spite of our economic, social and governmental difficulties, our future citizens must be built up now. We may delay other problems but we can not delay the day-to-day care and instruction of our children.

In the rigid governmental economies that are requisite everywhere we must not encroach upon the schools or reduce the opportunity of the child through the school to develop adequate citizenship. There is no safety for our republic without the education of our youth. That is the first charge upon all citizens and local governments.

I have confidence that with adequate reduction of expenditures there can be ample amounts obtained from reasonable taxation to keep our school system intact and functioning satisfactorily. Those in charge of the schools must be willing to face conditions as they are, to cooperate in discarding all unnecessary expenditures, to analyze all procedures, and to carry forward on a solid basis of economy. But the schools must be carried on.

Above all, may I ask that throughout your deliberations you bear in mind that the proper care and training of our children is more important than any other process that is carried on by our Government? If we are to continue to educate our children, we must keep and sustain our teachers and our schools.

Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, chairman of the conference remarked:

You have met to decide what will happen to this generation of American children—what can be done to see that the boys and girls of today are not robbed of their educational birthright. You must take an aggressive attitude toward schools if we are to keep them open. It is not a matter of passing resolutions but a matter of fighting. Fight through! Fight highways! Fight politics! Fight all groups! It is worth while.

A few of the 40 resolutions adopted by the conference, are here-with reproduced:

1. Education is a fundamental obligation of a public policy, related inseparably to long-term economic conditions and to the forms of governmental administration set up by organized society to provide for the general welfare.

4. Education is a necessity not a luxury since the growth of the child can not be halted or postponed during an economic emergency. Therefore, educational service should be accorded a high degree of priority in determining the purposes and services which shall be supported by the states during a depression.

9. The state must assume the responsibility within its means of assuring adequate public education to all local communities, irrespective of their financial condition.

12. All governments, local, state and national, should direct attention to the immediate reformation of the system of taxation.

16. The Conference is opposed to the shortening of the school year below the term existing previous to the depression, because such action will be a limitation upon the educational opportunities of the children, which in the long run will be neither economically nor educationally profitable.

17. The teaching load should not be increased either in courses or hours, beyond the ability of the individual teacher to offer a reasonable standard of instruction to each pupil, and should be adjusted in relation to the quality of supervision, the experience and qualifications of the teacher, the provisions for exceptional pupils, and the methods of grouping pupils.

33. If the state is to have during the coming generation institutions adequate to serve its needs, it must not now unwisely weaken the human foundations of those institutions.

36. The peculiar position of public education in our democracy, supported and guided by local initiative and directly accountable to it, suggests that there should be set up in every locality, councils broadly representative to mobilize and clarify public opinion in order to deal more generously and wisely with the present crisis in education.

40. Because of the need of definite information on school costs at this time, the Conference regrets that the Congress found it necessary to discontinue the study of school finance carried on under the direction of the United States Office of Education, and expresses the hope that at an early date ways may be found to resume that important and especially timely study.

### THE CALIFORNIA WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILD HEALTH AND PROTECTION

The California White House Conference on Child Health and Protection is well under way. To date, five conferences have been held—a state conference at San Francisco on November 11 and 12, 1932; and four district conferences at Los Angeles, January 14; Sacramento, January 21; Fresno, January 28, and Oakland, February 4, 1933. At each of these conferences the state organization plan and the plan of work have been explained and discussed. The state and district White House Conference committees, composed of representatives of 75 state-wide organizations, have endorsed the plans and promised their interest and support in the many county and community conferences to be held within the next 18 months.

The plan of organization calls for an executive conference in each county of the state, executive conferences in every community in each county of the state, and several public conferences in each community of the state. In the public conferences in the communities facts will be disseminated regarding child welfare conditions and programs in the community and these compared with the standards which should obtain, as recommended by the National White House Conference.

The section and committee plan of the conference is as follows:

### SECTION I—MEDICAL SERVICE

#### *Committees*

- A. Growth and Development
- B. Prenatal and Maternal Care
- C. Medical Care

### SECTION II—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE AND ADMINISTRATION

#### *Committees*

- A. Public Health Organization
- B. Communicable Disease Control
- C. Milk Production and Control

### SECTION III—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

#### *Committees*

- A. The Family and Parent Education
- B. The Infant and Preschool Child
- C. The School Child
- D1. Vocational Guidance
- D2. Child Labor
- E1. Recreation
- E2. Physical Education
- F. Special Classes
- G. Youth Outside of Home and School

### SECTION IV—SOCIAL WELFARE

#### *Committees*

- A. Community Organization for Social Welfare
- B1. Physically Handicapped
- B2. Mentally Handicapped
- C1. Dependency and Neglect
- C2. Delinquency and Probation
- D1. Foster Homes and Adoptions
- D2. Institutional Relations
- D3. Family Guidance and Cooperation

State chairmen and county chairmen for each of the above-named sections and committees have already been appointed. Community chairmen for each section and committee will be appointed in the near future. The state executive committee will continue to assist county and community executive committees in the development of their conference plans.

### MEMBERSHIP IN NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Information from the National Education Association concerning 1932 membership in the association from California has been received by the Department of Education. Of particular interest are the following facts:

1. Of the 40,700 teachers estimated as employed in California, 20,416, or 50 per cent, are members of the National Educational Association.



2. California stands third among the states in total number of members, and fifth in percentage of the total number of teachers who are members.
3. Los Angeles ranks second among the cities in total number of members with a total of 4678, being exceeded only by Philadelphia with a total of 5206.
4. The California membership in the National Education Association decreased from 24,731 in 1931 to 20,416 in 1932, a total decrease of 4315.

Owing to the emergency facing education throughout all parts of the United States, the National Education Association is faced with many increased responsibilities and additional services. The extensive research and publicity activities of the association involve additional revenues.

Mr. F. D. Martin, Director, Division of Records and Membership, asks that school administrative officers urge upon teachers the importance of continuing their membership in the association during these critical times.

#### **ASSOCIATION FOR CHILDHOOD EDUCATION CONVENTION**

More than one thousand teachers from all parts of the United States are expected to attend the annual convention of the Association for Childhood Education which will meet in Denver, June 27 to July 1, 1933. The five-day program will be headed by educators of national and international prominence.

The Association for Childhood Education is an outgrowth of the International Kindergarten Union and the National Council of Primary Education. The International Kindergarten Union met in Denver 37 years ago. The 1933 meeting marks the first return of the Association to Denver since 1895. The 1932 convention was held in Washington, D. C.

The local committee in charge of the Denver meeting is made up of teachers of the Denver Public Schools. Arrangements for an elaborate pageant, to be staged in the Park of the Red Rocks on June 30, are already under way.

#### **ILLUSTRATED LECTURE ON CHILD LABOR**

The National Child Labor Committee has prepared a lecture on child labor illustrated by 40 lantern slides, suitable for presentation before church groups, women's clubs, and high school and college students.

Application for the lecture and slides including a statement as to the exact date on which they are to be used and the address to which they are to be sent, should be made to the National Child Labor Committee, 419 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

### **TREE PLANTING IN MEMORY OF CALVIN COOLIDGE**

The Outdoor Christmas Tree Association of California asks that schools, garden clubs, service clubs, girl and boy scout clubs, and individuals plant trees, preferably outdoor Christmas trees, on California's official Arbor Day, March 7 (Luther Burbank's birthday), in memory of Calvin Coolidge, former President of the United States.

### **POMONA COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS**

Pomona College announces several new scholarships for the school year 1933-1934 for freshmen and for students transferring from junior colleges. Certain of the scholarships run as high as \$500 per year. High school principals are requested to convey this information to members of their senior classes who may be interested. Detailed information may be secured from Howard H. Pattee, Director of Admissions, Pomona College, Claremont, California.

### **SCHOLARSHIP OFFERED BY COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES**

The Colorado School of Mines offers a four-year scholarship to a California student who may be a recent graduate of high school or who may have had several years of college work. The applicant should have scholarship standing in the upper third of his high school, preparatory, or college classes and possess those other qualifications essential to the making of an engineer. The value of the scholarship is approximately \$250 per year or \$1,000 for the four-year course.

School administrators should recommend to the Superintendent of Public Instruction not later than July 15, 1933, any candidate who may be interested in this scholarship and who is able to meet the requirements.

### **SCHOLARSHIPS AT THE GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS**

The George Peabody College for Teachers has allocated four scholarships of \$25 each to California for the summer session of 1933. The scholarships are credited toward tuition only and not toward any other fees.

The requirements are:

1. The student must be in attendance on George Peabody College during the entire 12 weeks of the summer session.

2. The applicant must be engaged in teaching or planning to take up teaching immediately.
3. No applicant is eligible who has been enrolled in college during the academic year just preceding.
4. Recommendations for the awarding of the scholarships must be made by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction officially.
5. Our Committee on Scholarships must receive notice of the recommendations for the scholarships by May 15, 1933. In no case will applications be acted upon after May 15.

Those interested in securing one of the above scholarships should notify the State Superintendent of Public Instruction before April 1, 1933.

#### **IMPOSTOR OBTAINING MONEY FROM SCHOOL EMPLOYEES**

Information has come to the Department of Education that a person has been obtaining money from persons employed in school positions by falsely representing that he is employed in the Santa Maria schools.

This matter is being called to your attention in order that you may make appropriate announcement of it.

# PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE

## REVIEWS

JOHN EDWARD SEYFRIED. *The Contractual Status of California City School Superintendents*. (University of California Publications in Education. Volume 7, No. 2, pp. 63-144.) Berkeley: University of California Press, 1933.

This recently published investigation sets out to answer five questions relating to the contractual status of California city school superintendents:

1. What provisions in the California State Laws, in the Rules and Regulations of the California State Board of Education, and in charters of California cities, and what court decisions directly affect contracts between city school superintendents and city boards of education?
2. What are the types of contracts used in California between city school superintendents and city boards of education?
3. How closely do the contracts of California city school superintendents with city boards of education conform to the requirements of California law?
4. What professional status have California city school superintendents acquired by contract, and how does this status compare with the status recommended for city school superintendents by authorities in educational administration?
5. What should be the content and form of a contract which will guarantee to city school superintendents of California a professional status equal, as nearly as possible, to the status recommended for these persons by authorities in educational administration?

In his attack upon the problems involved by these questions, Dr. Seyfried has first made an exhaustive analysis of California written law to discover all provisions relating to or affecting contracts between superintendents and boards of education. He has next proceeded to an analysis of court decisions in which the subjects of such contracts are covered to obtain the interpretations placed upon legal provisions. This section of the study presents a complete picture of the law of contracts as it affects the relationship between superintendents and boards of education.

As a basis for evaluating the professional status now accorded California city superintendents of schools, an analysis was made of the recommendations of leading authorities on the subject of powers and duties which should reside in the office of the superintendent and of the relationship which should obtain between the superintendent and board of education. A compilation of these recommendations is used as a standard for comparing desirable status with that actually enjoyed by city superintendents of schools in California.

The legal status of superintendents was ascertained by an examination of School Code and city charter provisions relating to the powers and duties of the superintendent and by a study of contracts between superintendents and boards of education in 39 of the 45 city school districts in California. It was found that the laws of the state give the superintendent a very limited legal status and prescribe no powers or duties of any relative importance. The Rules and Regulations of the State Board of Education were found to contain no provisions which would enlarge these powers or duties. City charter provisions on the whole were found to enlarge somewhat the superintendents' legal status. Almost one-third of

the total of 250 such provisions were found to be in accordance with acceptable principles as stated by the authorities examined. Practically none of the provisions was detrimental to the superintendents' interests or imposed serious limitations upon his contractual possibilities.

An examination of the contracts between superintendents and boards of education disclosed that certain of the superintendents had by contract secured a professional status comparable to or approaching that recommended by authorities in educational administration.

Due to existing inadequate provisions of law, the contract is the only means by which a desirable professional status for school superintendents may be assured. Consequently, Dr. Seyfried developed a recommended contract form embodying the recommendations of authorities in educational administration and conforming to the legal findings of the study which "assures the city superintendent of schools a professional status as nearly approaching the status which educational authorities recommend as present California laws will permit."

This study is a valuable addition to research in educational administration. It should take its place as a leading contribution dealing with legal aspects of school administration. Its findings, while based upon the California situation, are not limited in their usefulness to this one state but are of more general significance. The adoption of the recommended contract form as an instrument for securing a desirable professional status for the superintendent of schools would guarantee vast improvement in educational organization and administration the country over.

IVAN R. WATERMAN

ELLWOOD P. CUBBERLEY. *An Introduction to the Study of Education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1933 (revised by Walter Crosby Eells). xx + 532 pp.

Originally published in 1925 this book has served as a textbook in general introductory survey courses in education both for prospective students of education and for others who desired orientation in the field of education.

Changed educational conditions and the availability of new data have made advisable a revised edition.

Two new chapters have been added: Chapter XI, "Physical Welfare of the School Child," and Chapter XXI, "Education of Special Classes." Considerable new matter by Mr. C. Gilbert Wrenn has been added to Chapter VII, "The Work and Training of the Teacher." Certain of the chapters dealing primarily with administration and organization have been condensed and combined so that relatively less space has been devoted to administration and relatively more space to the work of the teacher in the revised edition. Statistics based upon the 1930 Federal Census data and recent reports of the U. S. Office of Education have been included.

The value of the first edition has been well demonstrated. The revisions included in the new edition will continue the usefulness of the book for many years to come.

IVAN R. WATERMAN

## CURRENT PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

- BEATLEY, BANCROFT. *Achievement in the Junior High School*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Harvard Studies in Education, Vol. 18. 1932.
- BETTS, GILBERT L., FRAZIER, BENJAMIN W., and GAMBLE, GUY C. *National Survey of the Education of Teachers, Volume I, Selected Bibliography*. United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education Bulletin 1933, No. 10. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1932.
- BURSCH, JAMES FREDERICK, and MELTZER, H. *The New Examination, Its Construction and use*. Los Angeles: Southern California School Depository, Ltd., 1931.
- COE, GEORGE ALBERT. *Educating for Citizenship*. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1932.
- DOBSON, JOHN FREDERIC. *Ancient Education and Its Meaning to Us*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1932.
- HAEFNER, RALPH. *The Typewriter in the Primary and Intermediate Grades*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932.
- HOLMSTEDT, RALEIGH WARREN. *A Study of the Effects of the Teacher Tenure Law in New Jersey*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University. Contributions to Education, No. 526, 1932.
- HOPKINS, ERNEST MARTIN. *Education and Life*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1930.
- JARMAN, ARTHUR MERRITT. *The Administration of Laboratory Schools; a Study of Laboratory Schools Connected With Departments, Schools, and Colleges of Education in State Universities*. Ann Arbor: Geo. Wahr, 1932.
- REYNOLDS, ROLLO GEORGE and HARDEN, MARY. *The Horace Mann Plan for Teaching Children*. New York: Bureau of Publications. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932.
- ROANTREE, WILLIAM F., and TAYLOR, MARY S. *An Arithmetic for Teachers*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932.
- ROSE, MARY DAVIES. *Teaching Nutrition to Boys and Girls*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932.
- RUSSELL, CHARLES. *Rating School Pupils*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932.
- SHIPLEY, GERTRUDE LYSON. *An Evaluation of Guided Study and Small-group Discussion in a Normal School*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University. Contributions to Education, No. 486, 1932.
- SNEDDEN, DAVID SAMUEL. *Education for Political Citizenship*. New York Bureau of Publication. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932.
- STENQUIST, JOHN L., WOOD, BEN D., OSBURN, W. J., RUCH, G. M., TRABUE, M. R., KRAMER, GRACE A., LINDQUIST, E. F., and ANDERSON, H. R. *Educational Tests and Their Uses*. *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. III, No. 1, February, 1933. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1932.
- WEST, ANDREW FLEMING. *American General Education: a Short Study of Its Present Conditions and Needs*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1932.
- WHITCOMB, EMELINE S. *U. S. Government Publications Useful to Teachers of Home Economics*. Circular No. 50. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education, 1932.
- WHITCOMB, EMELINE S., and OTHERS. *Studies in Homemaking Education*. United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Circular No. 67. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education, 1932.
- WRIGHT, EDITH A., and GRAY, RUTH A. *Bibliography of Research Studies in Education: 1930-1931*. United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education Bulletin, 1932, No. 16. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1932.
- ZUBIN, JOSEPH. *Some Effects of Incentives: a Study of Individual Differences in Rivalry*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University. Contributions to Education, No. 532, 1932.



## MAGAZINE ARTICLES

- CRAMER, JOHN FRANCIS. "Relative Difficulty of Junior High School Social Studies Texts." *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. XXVI, No. 6, February, 1933, pp. 425-428.
- GRAY, WILLIAM S. "Summary of Reading Investigations (July 1, 1931 to June 30, 1932)." *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. XXVI, No. 6, February, 1933, pp. 401-424.
- GROSSNICKLE, F. E. "Equalization of the Burden of Capital Outlay in a State's Minimum Educational Program." *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. XXVI, No. 6, February, 1933, pp. 449-456.
- HUTCHINS, ROBERT M. "The American Educational System." *The School Review*, Vol. XLI, No. 2, February, 1933, pp. 95, 100.
- JOHNSON, B. LAMAR. "The Permanent Record Form in the Secondary School." *The School Review*, Vol. XLI, No. 2, February, 1933, pp. 114-122.
- KOOS, LEONARD V., and Collaborators. "Selected References on Secondary-school Instruction, II." *The School Review*, Vol. XLI, No. 2, February, 1933, pp. 129-146.
- ROSEN, T. S. "Curriculum Opportunities in the Small Six-year High School." *The School Review*, Vol. XLI, No. 2, February, 1933, pp. 123-128.